



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1460
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,252	09/15/2000	Sekaran Nanja	20706-000110US	3800

33031 7590 08/31/2005

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

DU, THUAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2116

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/663,252

Applicant(s)

NANJA, SEKARAN

Examiner

Thuan N. Du

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-14 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment filed on June 6, 2005.
2. Claims 2 and 4 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3 and 5-23 are presented for examination.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 5 recites "a user input device" in line 2. It is not clear that "a user input device" recited in claim 5 is the same or different from "a user input device" recited in claim 1, line 11.
6. Claims 6-7 are also rejected for incorporating the above deficiency by dependency.
7. Claim 8 recites "the configured" in line 3. It is not clear what is "the configured" mean. Appropriate correction is required.
8. Claims 9-12 are also rejected for incorporating the above deficiency by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rockwell et al. [Rockwell] (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,599).

Art Unit: 2116

10. Regarding claim 1, Rockwell teaches a method comprising:

creating a computing environment from a plurality of processing resources by allocating a plurality of the processing resources (CECs) [col. 4, lines 7-17] by displaying a list of the plurality of the processing resources on a display device (52) [Fig. 4; col. 4, lines 11-12], wherein

the display device (52) is coupled to a processor (70) [Fig. 1],

the processor is configured to effect the allocating [col. 3, lines 31-46], and

each of the plurality of the processing resources comprises at least one of a

hardware processor (41a,b,c,n respectively) [Fig. 1] and a software program [col. 4, lines 38-40];

accepting signals from a user input device (54) [col. 3, lines 36-38], wherein

the signals indicate the configuration of a selected processing resource of the processing resources [col. 4, lines 7-47]; and

the user input device (54) is coupled to the processor (70) [Fig. 1]; and

configuring the selected processing resource [col. 4, lines 7-47; col. 6, line 6 et seq.]

11. Regarding claim 5, Rockwell teaches the method further comprising:

accepting a first signal from the user input device to indicate a processing platform to be used [col. 4, lines 9-31];

accepting a second signal from the user input device to indicate a software component to be installed [col. 4, lines 31-36]; and

automatically installing the software component on the processing platform [col. 4, lines 38-42].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell et al. [Rockwell] (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,599).

13. Regarding claims 6 and 7, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that software programs could be loaded either from a local computer or a server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the software component taught by Rockwell could be either a server component or a client component.

14. Regarding claim 13, Rockwell teaches a method for allocating processing resources, the method employing a computer user interface coupled to a display screen and to an input device for generating signals in response to interactions of a user, the method comprising:

allocating the processing resources by

accepting a first signal from the input device (54, 56) which enables the user to specify an operating system for use in a computing environment [col. 4, lines 28-42];

accepting a second signal from the input device (54, 56) which enables the user to specify a processor for use within the computing environment [col. 4, lines 9-15];

activating an active operating system, wherein the active operating system is a specified operating system to run in the computing environment [Figs. 2a-h; col. 3, lines 47-48]; and

activating an active processor, wherein the active processor is a specified processor to run in the computing environment [Figs. 2a-h; col. 3, lines 47-48].

Rockwell does not explicitly teach that specific type of operating system and processor are selected. However, Rockwell discloses that the system includes a multiplicity of processors [col. 2, lines 33-34] and multiplicity of operating systems [col. 4, lines 28-41]. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2116

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that selecting a desired processor and a desired operating system is selecting a type of processor and a type of operating system.

15. Regarding claim 14, Rockwell teaches the method further comprising the step of displaying the computing environment, wherein the computing environment comprises the active processor and the active operating system [Fig. 10; col. 6, lines 1-22].

16. Regarding claim 18, Rockwell teaches that the active software program for the computing environment is displayed in response to user selection [col. 4, lines 32-35].

17. Regarding claim 19, Rockwell teaches that the system accepting a signal, wherein the signal allows the user to shut down the computing environment [Fig. 2i].

18. Regarding claim 20, Rockwell teaches that the system accepting a signal which allows the user to specify a new machine to run in the computing environment [col. 5, lines 18-20], to activate the new machine [col. 6, lines 1-2] and to display the computing environment having the active machine [col. 6, lines 16-18].

19. Regarding claim 21-23, Rockwell teaches that a plurality of processors and software programs are displayed for user selection [col. 4, lines 9-15, 34-35].

20. Regarding claims 16 and 17, Rockwell teaches the claimed method steps. Therefore, Rockwell teaches the apparatus to implement the claimed method steps. Since claims 16 and 17 do not teach or further define over the limitations recited in the rejected claims above, therefore, claims 16 and 17 are also rejected as being unpatentable over Rockwell for the same reasons set forth in the rejected claims above.

Allowable Subject Matter

21. Claim 15 is allowed. Claims 8-12 are also allowable if the above 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections have overcome.
22. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Argument

23. Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
24. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that "Rockwell's disclosure thus fails to describe the need to allocate a processing resource, nor the manner in which a processing resource should be allocated to create a computing environment, but merely provide for the activation/deactivation of a processor or group of processors." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Rockwell clearly allocates processing resource(s) and configures the selected processing resource(s) to create a computing environment [col. 4, lines 7-47].

Conclusion

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2116

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan N. Du whose telephone number is (571) 272-3673. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne H. Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670.

Central TC telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

The fax number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



Thuan N. Du
August 25, 2005